

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-36 and 38-47 are currently pending.

Claims 1-14, 18-29, 31, 36, 38-42 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0060896 A9 to Hulai et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2008/0313282 A1 to Warila and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034833 A1 to Kougiouris et al. Claims 35 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Kougiouris. Claims 15-17 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Warila and Kougiouris and further in view of United States Patent No. 7,010,573 B1 to Saulpaugh et al. Claims 13 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hulai in view of Warila and Kougiouris and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,868,441 to Greene et al. In previous responses, Applicants have argued that the relationship between the screen component and the data component is dynamic that allows modifications. Thus, as disclosed in the specification, modifications made to either a screen component or the data component can be propagated to the other component. In correspondence received from the Examiner, it is stated that the claims do not include the limitations that Applicants argue distinguish the claims for the cited references. In addition, the Examiner proposed amendments to the claims to include these limitations.

Applicants have reviewed the proposals offered by the Examiner. In general, Applicants agree with the proposed amendment with the exception of the addition that the “mapping [uses] metadata expressed in a structured language.” Applicants respectfully submit that the type of structured language, i.e. metadata, is not necessary for patentability. Applicants note that preamble designates that the data component and the screen component are “defined in a structured definition language” and suggest that this reference is sufficient to denote that a structured definition language is used. Otherwise, Applicants have amended the claims to conform with the Examiner’s suggestions.

Serial No. 10/788,490

Bibr et al

Case No. RIM00025

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combinations of Hulai, Warila, Kougiouris, Saulpaugh and Greene do not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the limitations of independent claims 1, 18, 35, 36 and 38. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that these independent claims are patentable over the cited combinations. As claims 2-17, 18-34, 38-47 depend on these independent claims, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the references for the same reasons. Applicants request that the rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **50-5278**.

Respectfully submitted,
Bibr, Viera, et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola Mobility, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **20280**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No.: 37,585

Telephone: 847-523-2339

Fax: 847-523-2350